

DOCUMENT 25/5

The relative merits of the Class names "Polyzoa" and "Bryozoa"

By D. A. BROWN

(Senior Lecturer in Geology, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand)

(Letter dated 24th November 1953)¹

As it seems likely, from my reading of recent numbers of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, that the Commission will soon make pronouncements on the naming of Taxonomic Categories above the Family level, I am prompted to make some observations in regard to the relative merits of the names Polyzoa and Bryozoa (Reference: Document 4/3, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 10:3). As an active worker on the group, I may say, from the outset that I firmly support the late Sir Sidney Harmer's preference for the term "Polyzoa" for reasons that will appear below.

First, there is no question as to the priority in time of J. Vaughan Thompson's "Polyzoa". This point was fully dealt with by Harmer during the discussion on the two names by the Linnean Society of London in 1910 (*Proc. linn. Soc. Lond.* Session 123, esp. pp. 70-71).

Second, it is quite clear that Thompson recognized the Polyzoa as a distinct type of structure in the Animal Kingdom and his term "Polyzoa" may, therefore, quite fairly be used as that of a Class or Phylum.

In all the arguments over the relative merits of the terms Polyzoa and Bryozoa it has often been contended that because of the quaint wording employed by Thompson in his memoir (Zoological Researches, Memoir V, "On Polyzoa, a new animal discovered as an inhabitant of some Zoophytes, with a description of the newly instituted Genera of *Pedicellaria* and *Vesicularia*", December, 1830), the value of his term "Polyzoa" was never

¹ This case has an associated Registered Number Z.N.(S.) 1310.

Bull. zool. Nomencl. Vol. 15, Double-Part 16/17 March 1958.

quite certain, being sometimes employed in the singular, sometimes in the plural, "Polyzoae". In fact, one famous controversialist strongly suggested that Thompson regarded the term as of generic value, a contention immediately dispelled by the wording of the title to Thompson's paper which shows that it is, in fact, a group term.

A close examination of the various arguments that were put forward at the aforementioned meeting of the Linnean Society of London in 1910, shows that although Thompson's Memoir was attacked vigorously on the grounds of bad syntax and grammatical construction, there was no denying the praise given to Thompson for the thoroughness of his researches and for his clear understanding of the group of animals that he was studying. It was not what he did but what he said that provided the proponents of the term "Bryozoa" with their chief arguments.

Oddly enough, it was never suggested that any critical examination be given to the work of the originator of the term "Bryozoa", probably a mere coincidence. The term was first introduced by C. G. Ehrenberg in a portion of the "Symbolae Physicae" dated March 1831, a publication of much wider distribution and availability than Thompson's Memoir. (Incidentally, the late Sir Sidney Harmer in his application, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 230-231, was mistaken in thinking that the term "Bryozoa" did not occur in this work.)

Ehrenberg defined his *Circulus Bryozoa* in the following terms: "Oreanoque distinctis, tubo cibario perfecto. (Vibratio aperta ciliorum ope, an omnibus? Ovipara et gemmipara, sponte nunquam dividua)". This is scarcely a precise diagnosis, but then let us see what Ehrenberg ascribes to his Bryozoa. Not only what we call the Polyzoa but also a goodly portion of the Corals, the Sertularian Hydroids, and probably some of the other Coelenterata. So, although Ehrenberg's definition does give the more important characters of the Polyzoa, he had not, unlike Thompson, really discovered that they were unique. It is even more surprising to find that eight years later (*Phys. Abhandl. K. Akad. Wiss.*, Berlin (1838), pp. 59-120, 1839), when Ehrenberg brought out a fresh classification of the invertebrates, excluding insects, he included in his Order Bryozoa not only the groups mentioned above, but also added the Foraminifera. Thus, we may criticize Ehrenberg not only for what he did but also for what he said.

While it may be argued that, in general, the term "Bryozoa" has been employed more widely, geographically speaking, than the term "Polyzoa", it is important to note that a large proportion of the work on the Phylum has been done by workers who have spoken of these animals as Polyzoa (Busk, Allman, Hincks, Norman, Kirkpatrick, MacGillivray, Maplestone, Gray, Johnston, Lang, and in our own time, Miss Hastings and, most famous of all, the late Sir Sidney Harmer).

I believe that Vaughan Thompson's term "Polyzoa" should be universally adopted, not only because of its clear priority in time, but also as a tribute to a scientific worker of great merit. (See Harmer, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 230-231.) The obscurity of his published work should not be allowed to deprive him of his right to recognition.